UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/772,041	02/03/2004	Mike S. Choi	42P17995	3899

45209   7590   08/18/2009

INTEL/BSTZ
BLAKELY SOKOLOFF TAYLOR & ZAFMAN LLP
1279 OAKMEAD PARKWAY
SUNNYVALE, CA 94085-4040

EXAMINER
NGUYEN, KIMNHUNG T

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2629	

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
08/18/2009	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

-- *The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address* --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE *3* MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *29 May 2009*.

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**.   2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-20* is/are pending in the application.

     4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-20* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

     Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

     Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

     a)☐ All   b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

        1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

        2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

        3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

     * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date *5/29/09*.

4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .

5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application

6) ☐ Other: _____ .

DETAILED ACTION

1.   This application has been examined. The claims 1-20 are pending. The examination

results are as following.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

2.   The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in
> section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are
> such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person
> having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the
> manner in which the invention was made.

3.   Claims 1-3, 6-10 and 15-19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable

over Tamura et al. (US 2002/005,7265) in view of Hamlin (US 2004/021,610).

        As to claim 1, Tamura et al. disclose in fig. 8, an article comprising: a storage medium

comprising machine-readable instructions stored thereon to: execute a software driver (see RAM

512) for a display codec (548), the software driver configured to work with a plurality of display

codecs (see interface IC decodes) of the software driver (512, see [0215]) when the display codec

should be an inherent is changed (see the control circuit 510 causes the display driver IC 512

with a built-in RAM to supply text data as the display data or **set the moving image display**

region, see [0200], and see **the display data to be read can be with certainty the new display**

data in the frame, see [0252]). Then clearly, the display data set the moving image display

region and the display data read can be with certainty the new display data in the frame

corresponds to the display codec is changed); and transmit digital signals from the display codec

to a display using the software driver (see [0213], [0216]). However, Tamura et al. do not specifically disclose the display remaining in a default configuration. Hamlin discloses in fig. 1, a software driver (see RAM, CPU, ROM, software control logic, see [0027]), and a plurality of display (see displays 121,122,123,124, see [0028]), and these displays remaining in a default configuration (see a mode table 175 is created with default display configuration setting or values that are stored in the media drive, see [0036].

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to implement a software driver, and a plurality of display in a default configuration as taught by Hamlin into the system of Tamura et al. having the software driver configured to work with a plurality of display codecs of the software driver (512) when the display codec should be changed for producing the claimed invention because this would provide the display state which is stored includes display configuration information for each of the displays in particular display state, and default configuration information entries or values corresponding to detected display state are read from the mode table as per block (see [0036]).

As to claim 2, Tamura et al. disclose further wherein the software driver comprises machine readable instructions to recognize each of a plurality of displays (see display of 110, 512, 514, 516, fig. 8).

As to claim 3, Tamura et al. disclose further wherein the plurality of displays consist of digital displays selected from the group consisting of flat panel, LCD (liquid crystal display) (see fig. 8).

As to claim 6, Tamura et al. disclose further wherein the storage medium receives the digital signals from a wireless transmission device (542, fig. 8).

As to claim 7 is rejected as the same as claim 1.

As to claim 8, Tamura et al. disclose further wherein the software driver is part of a graphics controller (see controller 510) for communicating with the display codec.

As to claim 9, Tamura et al. disclose further wherein the display codec comprises a hardware portion (see display driver IC 100, fig. 5) that communicates with the software driver such that the graphics controller recognizes each of a plurality of different display codecs at different periods of time (see 0214).

As to claim 10, Tamura et al. disclose further, where the software driver (RAM) comprises a storage medium for the graphics controller known as a universal software driver.

As to claim 15 is rejected as the same as claim 1.

As to claim 16, Tamura et al. disclose further, the graphics controller (510) of claim 15 wherein the software driver comprises a universal software driver (see [0060-0068]).

As to claim 17, Tamura et al. disclose the graphics controller (510) of claim 15 further comprising a storage medium for the software driver that communicates with a display codec, the software driver recognizing each of a plurality of display codecs (see [0214]).

As to claims 18, 19 are rejected as the same as claims 15-17.

4.   Claim 4 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Tamura et al. (US 2002/0057265) and Hamlin (US 2004/021,610) and in view of Swartz et al. (US 2005/0104899).

Tamura et al. and Hamlin do not disclose the digital signals from cable television outlet.

Swartz et al. disclose a display system having the digital signals from cable television outlet (see

0026-0028). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the

invention was made to implement the digital signals from cable television outlet as taught by

Swart et al. into the system of Tamura et al. and Hamlin for producing the claimed invention

because this would any number and type of well-known digital formats, such as, JPEG, BMP,

TIFF, BNC composite, serial digital, parallel digital, RGB, or consumer digital video (see 0027).

5.   Claims 5, 11-14 and 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over

Tamura et al. (US 2002/0057265) and Hamlin (US 2004/021,610) and in view of Schulz et al.

(US 2005/0155043).

As to claim 5, Tamura et al. and Hamlin do not disclose that wherein the storage medium

receives the digital signals from a satellite. Tamura et al. disclose a communication interface

from a storage medium such as a satellite transceiver (see 0042).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention

was made to implement the storage medium such as a satellite transceiver as taught by Schulz et

al. into the system of Tamura et al. and Hamlin for producing the claimed invention because this

would the information to the user.

As to claim 11, Tamura et al. disclose in fig. 5, a system comprising a processor (CPU,

see 0209); a memory coupled to the processor to support the processor operations; and the

memory for network communications; a display (LCD 110) that communicatively couples with

the processor through a display codec (548, fig. 8) to display images from image signals that are

received at the system in a digital format; and a graphics controller (510) having a software

driver (RAM 512) configured to work with display codecs, the software driver configured to

work with a plurality of display codecs (see interface IC decodes) of the software driver (512,

see [0215]) when the display codec should be an inherent is changed (see the control circuit 510

causes the display driver IC 512 with a built-in RAM to supply text data as the display data or

set the moving image display region, see [0200], and see **the display data to be read can be**

with certainty the new display data in the frame, see [0252]). Then clearly, the display data

set the moving image display region, or the display data read can be with certainty the new

display data in the frame corresponds to the display codec is changed); and transmit digital

signals from the display codec to a display using the software driver (see [0213], [0216]), and the

graphic controller being communicatively coupled to the processor (see, [0209]).

However, Tamura et al. do not disclose an Ethernet card interoperating with the

processor, and a plurality of display remaining in a default configuration.

Hamlin discloses in fig. 1, a software driver (see RAM, CPU, ROM, software control

logic, see [0027]), and a plurality of display (see displays 121,122,123,124, see [0028]), and

these displays remaining in a default configuration (see a mode table 175 is created with default

display configuration setting or values that are stored in the media drive, see [0036].

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention

was made to implement a software driver, and a plurality of display in a default configuration as

taught by Hamlin into the system of Tamura et al. having the software driver configured to work

with a plurality of display codecs of the software driver when the display codec should be

changed for producing the claimed invention because this would provide the display state which

is stored includes display configuration information for each of the displays in particular display

state, and default configuration information entries or values corresponding to detected display

state are read from the mode table as per block (see [0036]).

Schulz et al. disclose in fig. 2, the processor comprises an Ethernet card (22, see 0006).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention

was made to implement the processor comprises an Ethernet card as taught by Schulz et al. into

the system of Tamura et al. and Hamlin for producing the claimed invention because this would

provide client-server system typically use a network card to   communicate data to the server via

a computer network (see 0006).

As to claim 12, Tamura et al. disclose further, wherein the software driver comprises a

universal software driver (see [0060-0068]).

As to claim 13, Tamura et al. disclose further wherein the display is a digital display.

As to claim 14, Tamura et al. disclose further wherein the display is selected from the

group consisting of flat panel, LCD (liquid crystal display, see fig. 8).

As to claim 20, Tamura et al. and Hamlin do not disclose that wherein said emulating

replacing the first one of the plurality of display codecs comprises replacing the first of the

plurality of display codecs with an SDVO codec. It would have been obvious skill in the art to

have the replacing display codecs with an SDVO codec to the claimed invention because Tamura

et al. disclose a plurality of other display codecs (see fig. 8).

Response to Argument

6.   Applicant's arguments filed 5/29/09 have been fully considered but they are not

persuasive.

Applicant states that "Tamura, Hamlin and Swartz were combined, such a combination

would lack "remaining in a default configuration of the software driver when the display codec is

changed", as recited in amended claim 1.

Examiner respectively disagrees because Tamura et al. disclose in fig. 8, an article

comprising: a storage medium comprising machine-readable instructions stored thereon to:

execute a software driver (see RAM 512) for a display codec (548), the software driver

configured to work with a plurality of display codecs (see interface IC decodes) of the software

driver (512, see [0215]) when the display codec should be an inherent is changed (see the control

circuit 510 causes the display driver IC 512 with a built-in RAM to supply text data as the

display data or **set the moving image display region**, see [0200], and see **the display data to be**

read can be with certainty the new display data in the frame, see [0252]). Then clearly, the

display data set the moving image display region or the display data read can be with certainty

the new display data in the frame corresponds to the display codec is changed); and transmit

digital signals from the display codec to a display using the software driver (see [0213], [0216]).

However, Tamura et al. do not specifically disclose the display remaining in a default

configuration. Hamlin discloses in fig. 1, a software driver (see RAM, CPU, ROM, software

control logic, see [0027]), and a plurality of display (see displays 121,122,123,124, see [0028]),

and these displays remaining in a default configuration (see a mode table 175 is created with

default display configuration setting or values that are stored in the media drive, see [0036].

Therefore, the combination of Tamura et al. and Hamlin are satisfied for its intended purpose.

For these reasons, the rejections are maintained.

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time

policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE

MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO

MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after

the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period

will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37

CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event,

however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing

date of this final action.

Correspondence

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the

examiner should be directed to KIMNHUNG NGUYEN whose telephone number is (571)272-

7698. The examiner can normally be reached on MON-FRI, FROM 8:30 AM-5:30 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's

supervisor, Richard Hjerpe can be reached on (571) 272-7691. The fax phone number for the

organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent

Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications

may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished

applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR

system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR

system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would

like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated

information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/K. N./

Examiner, Art Unit 2629

/Richard Hjerpe/

Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2629